Technical Manuscript Review Form

| TitleNext Generation Ambient Air Monitoring for Benzene and Toluene Compared with Traditional Methods at the Fenceline of an Indiana Oil Refinery | | Author(s) Motria Caudill, Wayne Whipple, Karen Oliver, Donald Whitaker | |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | Project Officer/Organization/Address | |
| Date Review Requested | Date Review Requested | | |
| *************************************** | 7/8/15 | | |
| Type of Publication/Audience | | Reviewer/Organization/Address | |
| Presentation | | Eben Thoma EPA ORD NRMRL | |
| Review Coordinator (e.g., PO, TIM, Supervisor) | | | |

You are asked to review and comment on the attached manuscript. Feel free to make notations on the manuscript as well as in the comments section below, particularly regarding your recommendations for revisions. if you are unable to review the manuscript by the required date, please return it now. You suggestions for alternate or additional reviewers will be welcomed.

| SUMMARY RATING | | | RECOMMENDATIONS |
|---|--------------|----------------|--|
| Please rate the manuscript as follows: | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | 2. |
| Content & scope | X | | (1) Acceptable as is |
| Organization & presentation | х | | (2) X Acceptable after minor revisions |
| Quality of data & validity of analytical techniques | X | | (3) Acceptable after major revisions |
| Soundness of Conclusions | Х | | (4) Not acceptable |
| Editorial Quality | × | | If you have checked either 3 or 4, |
| Other (specify) | | | please specifically state reason(s) in the comments space below. |
| | | Ĺ | f L |
| | | | Reviewer's Signature Date |

Comments: (Use extra sheets if needed):

Nice slides, please comments in electronic version. I think there are several points that should be addressed prior to publication. (1) I would include a benzene version of slide 19. This would be very interesting to see for the audience I think. (2) The point should be clarified that benzene is only compound that is part of the proposed rule. (3) How did you handle below MDL values in the rolled-up GC data? (4) Do you have duplicate data for the sampling? This would provide added value for the audience. (5) Conclusion, second bullet. Is there a statistically significant difference between any of the groups?

Tech. Rev. Form EPA363